

As disabled veterans age, their disabilities often cause problems at an increasing rate. Therefore, we absolutely must increase their COLA's with the rate of inflation and we really should do more for them.

I believe our priorities are wrong when we are spending \$15 billion more on airlift than necessary by buying the enormously expensive C-17 air cargo plane. Our priorities are wrong when we are signing up for 20 more B-2 bombers that the Department of Defense does not even want at an eventual cost of at least \$30 billion.

Rather than waste more taxpayer dollars on these outmoded cold war systems, it is far more important for us to attempt to repay the debt we owe our disabled veterans and their survivors. They have made tremendous sacrifices on our behalf and we do not do enough for them.

Before I close, I want to pay tribute to my colleague, Mr. MONTGOMERY. He has worked incredibly hard on behalf of our Nation's veterans for many, many years. We all appreciate the contributions you have made and I look forward to working with you throughout the remainder of this Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the veterans disability compensation cost of living adjustment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Oregon. She has been very supportive of veterans' programs. She has always been there when we have asked for her support. She has never voted against one of the veterans' bills. I look forward to working with the gentlewoman for 14, 15 more months. I thank the gentlewoman for talking on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2394.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT AMENDING AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND GERMANY ON SOCIAL SECURITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-123)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee

on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act (the "Act"), as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216; 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Second Supplementary Agreement Amending the Agreement Between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany on Social Security (the Second Supplementary Agreement), which consists of two separate instruments: a principal agreement and an administrative arrangement. The Second Supplementary Agreement, signed at Bonn on March 6, 1995, is intended to modify certain provisions of the original United States-Germany Social Security Agreement, signed January 7, 1976, which was amended once before by the Supplementary Agreement of October 2, 1986.

The United States-Germany Social Security Agreement is similar in objective to the social security agreements with Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The present Second Supplementary Agreement, which would further amend the 1976 Agreement to update and clarify several of its provisions, is necessitated by changes that have occurred in U.S. and German law in recent years. Among other things, it would extend to U.S. residents the advantages of recent German Social Security legislation that allows certain ethnic German Jews from Eastern Europe to receive German benefits based on their Social Security coverage in their former homelands.

The United States-Germany Social Security Agreement, as amended, would continue to contain all provisions mandated by section 233 and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4) of the Act.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Social Security Administration explaining the key points of the Second Supplementary Agreement, along with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the effect of the amendments on the principal agreement and the related administrative arrangement. Annexed to this report is the report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Act on the effect of the agreement on income and expenditures of the U.S. Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the agreement. The Department of State and the Social Security

Administration have recommended the Second Supplementary Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend the United States-Germany Second Supplementary Social Security Agreement and related documents.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 10, 1995.

## TOLERANCE AND JUSTICE FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today my city of Denver and many other Coloradans went to the Supreme Court and a very, very powerful argument was put together by my city and many others that would say that all Americans, all Americans, have the right to equal protection of the laws, including gay men and lesbians. Amendment 2 was adopted by a slim majority in my State of Colorado in 1992, and this is the final culmination of it in the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand in this well, the word "tolerance" is right here to my left. The word "justice" is right behind me. Those kinds of words are printed all over and chiseled on stone all throughout this great city. The issue today is do we really mean it.

Justice Ginsburg made a compelling analogy to the suffragettes, pointing out that when they could not win the right to vote nationally, they went to localities to do that. I certainly hope that the outcome continues to be in accordance with the words that we have chiseled on all of our stones around here about tolerance and justice and equal protection for all.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court today heard a powerful argument on behalf of the city of Denver and other parties that a majority of voters cannot override the right to equal protection of the laws enjoyed by all Americans, including gay men and lesbians.

Amendment 2, adopted by a slim majority of voters in 1992, would have deprived all branches of Colorado government of the power to remedy any claim of discrimination based on homosexual, lesbian, or bisexual orientation. Some people have framed this as a special protection issue, but it is clear that what is at issue is the right of people to be free from arbitrary, irrational discrimination based on their sexual orientation. Equal treatment, not special treatment, is the issue. Even more fundamentally, what is at stake is the ability of one group of voters to place roadblocks in the way of others who seek to participate in the political process.

Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg made a compelling analogy in this morning's argument to the suffragists and their struggle to win the vote for women. She noted that when suffragists were unable to win the right to vote on a broader basis, they sought and won the right to vote in certain localities. It would have been an outrageous interference with the political gains made by suffragists at the local level for a State to move to invalidate those local voting laws. Similarly, it is unacceptable for a slim